

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action of July 25, 2008.

Claims 43 and 63 are objected to because they depend from claims 39 and 53 respectfully, which are withdrawn from further consideration. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 43 and 63 have been withdrawn.

Claims 1-9 and 67-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-9 and 67-76 have been amended to be computer-implemented method claims. For this reason, these claims are believed to be statutory.

Claims 1-8, 10-17, 67-76, and 120-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldis et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0039916) in view of Ross et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,553,143) and further in view of Stupek Jr. et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,189).

Claims 1, 10, 67 and 120 include the feature that “the licenses are selected in the batch mode from a license search result page”. This feature is not shown or made obvious by the cited prior art.

The examiner states that:

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Ross does disclose that “the licenses are selected in the batch mode from a license search result page”. For example, Ross made it clear that one or more licenses in a batch of licenses can be enabled to create a software license. Accordingly, Ross does disclose the claimed limitation. Furthermore, Aldis discloses a license pack. A license pack contains one or more digital licenses. Arguably, a license pack is equivalent to the multiple software license

in a batch mode as disclosed by present invention. For these reasons, claims 1, 10, 67 and 120 are not patentable over the references of record.

However, the license packs of Aldis and the batch licenses of Ross are not selected from a license search page, as claimed in the independent claims.

For this reason, the claims are believed to be allowable.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 18, 2008

By: /Joseph P. O'Malley/
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910